



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,857	06/27/2003	Masaaki Ishiguro	030780	5843
23850	7590	01/06/2004		
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
			EXAMINER ESTRADA, ANGEL R	
			ART UNIT 2831	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,857

Applicant(s)

ISHIGURO ET AL.

Examiner

Angel R. Estrada

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato (US 6,043,431).

Regarding claim 1, Kato discloses an electric junction box (101) comprising; an insulating board (105); and a plurality of electrically conductive metal wire rods (106) having square shape cross section, (see figure 1) which are arranged on the insulating board (105), wherein an end of the metal wire rod (106) extends curvedly or straight forming a terminal part (106a) and at least a portion of the terminal part (106a) protrudes toward a housing of a body of the electric junction box (see figure 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 2, Kato discloses the electric junction box (101), wherein the metal wire rod (106) is cut to a suitable length, bent into a suitable shape, and on the insulating board (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 3, Kato discloses the electric junction box (101), wherein one terminal part (106a) of the metal wire rod (106) protrudes toward the housing (see figure 1), while an opposite terminal part (106a) of the metal wire rod (106) is connected to a component or a terminal or, alternatively, protrudes toward another housing (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 4, Kato discloses the electric junction box (101), wherein a terminal (106a) is directly connected to a middle portion in the longitudinal direction of the metal wire rod (106, see figure 1).

Regarding claim 8, Kato discloses a process for producing and electric junction box (101) comprising the extending curvedly or straight an end of a plurality of electrically conductive metal wire rods (106) having square or nearly square shape in cross section, thereby forming a terminal part (106a); arranging a plurality of the metal wire rods on an insulating board (105); and protruding at least a portion of the terminal part toward a housing of a body of the electric junction box (see figure 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 9, Kato discloses the process for producing an electric junction box (101), wherein the metal wire rod (106) is cut to a suitable length, bent into a suitable shape, and arranged on the insulating board (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 10, Kato discloses the process for producing an electric junction box (101), wherein one terminal part (106a) of the metal wire rod (106) protrudes toward the housing (see figure 1), while an opposite terminal part (106a) of the metal wire rod (106) is connected to a component or a terminal or, alternatively, protrudes toward another housing (see figure 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 11, Kato discloses the process for producing an electric junction box (101), wherein a terminal (106a) is directly connected to a middle portion in the longitudinal direction of the metal wire rod (106).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (US 6,043,431) in view of Bellinghausen et al (US 6,616,461, hereinafter Bellinghausen)

Regarding claim 6, Kato discloses the claimed invention except for the metal wire rod being subjected to tinning. Bellinghausen teaches a metal wire rod (26) being subjected to tinning. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to tinned Kato's metal wire rod as taught by Bellinghausen to improve the rod mechanical and electrical properties.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (US 6,043,431).

Regarding claim 7, Kato discloses the claimed invention except for the metal wire rod having 0.025 inches on a side. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the metal wire rod having 0.025 inches on a side, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re. Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 5 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The primary reasons for the indication of the allowability of claims 5 and 12 are:

Regarding claims 5 and 12 is the inclusion therein in combination as currently claimed of the limitation of the end of the metal wire rod being folded and compressed into a plate-shape thereby forming the terminal part

This limitation is found in claims 5 and 12, and is neither disclosed nor taught by the prior art of record, alone or in combination.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sakamoto (US 6,162,990), Ozaki et al (US 5,027,591 and US 5,295,842), Mori et al (US 5,393,934), Kobayashi et al (US 6,607,115), Sumida et al (US 6,506,060), Murakoshi et al (US 6,583,353), Murakami (US 5,902,138) and Hattori et al (US 6, 290,509) disclose and electrical junction box.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Angel R. Estrada at telephone number (703) 305-0853. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 -5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on (703) 308-3682. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

AE

December 23, 2003

 12/29/03
JEAN A. REICHARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800